Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.– I rise to a point of order, Sir. There is no provision under the Rules of Procedure where a question can be held over for the absence of the Minister concerned, especially when there are colleagues of his to answer. Otherwise, it may lead to a very unhealthy precedent. So often the Chief Minister is absent and his various colleagues have answered for him. If we say that because a question is listed in the name of a particular Minister that Minister alone will have to be present to answer it, it will be creating a precedent and the question standing in the name of a Minister will have to be held over until that Minister is in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order is raised saying that there is no rule which enables a question being held over under the circumstances which now prevail. But the hon'ble Member forgets that the discretion rests with the Speaker. The rule is explicit and clear. If a Member makes a request, I am bound to apply my mind to it. I do not know the contents of either the question or of the supplementaries that are likely to be put. Therefore, if a Member makes a request, I am bound to entertain it and apply my mind. Perhaps the special knowledge which the Minister for Public Works has, his colleagues may not have. In such circumstances, if a Member makes a request there is no breach of any rule and if there is no breach of rule there is no point of order.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have also raised another point. There are a large number of questions that have been tabled and if we take the number of days on which we meet it will be hardly possible for all the questions to come up here for oral answers. In view of this, if any questions are held over, it will curtail the privilege of another hon'ble Member whose question would otherwise have come up for oral answers. Thus, we may lose our right.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a matter of convenience and not a breach of any rule because no rule provides that a particular question must be taken up on a particular day. I can very well understand the inconvenience that might be caused, but I do not think it amounts to a violation of a rule or the violation of a privilege. Hereafter I will be careful when members make a request that a particular question may not be taken up on a day on which it is not convenient to him. All along when Ministers were not present, in the past on several occasions I have held over questions. For the absence of a Minister a Member is not responsible. If a Minister is absent some other Minister can answer and if that some other Minister and the Member desire that the question shoud be taken up on some other day, I do not think there is breach of any rule. The inconvenience that is likely to be caused is so unprecise. That this is likely to displace the question of another Member is no right. We do not know how many questions are ready for answer. We do not know on how many days they will be taken up. So, I will be careful when requests are made by Members in future. I am unable to entertain the point of order. Next question.